



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,242	02/01/2001	Fumio Nagasaka	107926	7319
25944	7590	04/15/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			PATEL, HARESH N	
P.O. BOX 19928			ART UNIT	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			PAPER NUMBER	
2154				
DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/701,242	NAGASAKA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Haresh Patel	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3,4,13-16 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3,4,13-16 and 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4,13-16 and 22-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/31/2005
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 4/8/2005
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 3, 4, 13-16, 21-26 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 17-20 are canceled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/31/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 3, 4, 13-16, 21-26 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1) "None of the applied art discloses: A device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network, said device retrieving apparatus comprising: an application unit, said application unit causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit, said application unit, when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description, gaining access to a database that is present in a server connected to the network, obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network, and causing at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit, as claimed in claim 3, or a device

retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network, said device retrieving apparatus comprising: a control unit, said control unit causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit, said control unit, when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description, gaining access to a database that is present in an apparatus connected to the network or in said device retrieving apparatus, obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network, and causing at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit, as claimed in claim 21". The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Claim 21 has been newly added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection. Please refer to the below rejections of this office action. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues, (2) “the Minasi (“Mastering Windows NT Server 4”, fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 373, Hereinafter Minasi) reference does not disclose, “person symbols and person information”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Minasi teaches the limitations, “person symbols (e.g., symbols for Eric, Darcee, Aministrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and person information (e.g., Eric being research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364)”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues, (3) “the combined teachings of the cited references may disclose all of the features of the claims but the motivation is inadequate to combine the references as the prior art references fail to provide a suggestion or motivation and the combination of references is made using improper hindsight reconstruction of the references”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. What applicant is trying to accomplish as an invention, i.e., a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device among a plurality of devices present on a network, is clearly taught by Hamner et al., 5,796,951, see abstract. The well-known concept of assigning network resource to a desired person, (e.g., table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364, figure 6.15, page 372, user related information on page 349), is taught by Minasi. The well known concept of dragging a software item and dropping it on another software item is taught by Person, “Using Windows 95”, Special edition, 1995, pages 105-107. Minasi's teachings of having user related information would help assign a network resource to a desired person. Hence, the user would be able to easily identify their personal items and manage their own personal settings. Person's teachings of dragging a software item and dropping it on

another software item would help mapping of the user and the user related information. Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of a primary reference. It is also not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinarily skill in the art. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 414, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); *In re Young*, 927 F.2d 588, 591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Priority

3. Applicant was requested (previous office actions dated, 8/30/2004 and 2/19/2004) to submit the translated priority document in English for the foreign priority document (i.e., claimed priority, JAPAN H-1191196 03/31/1999) for verification, in order to benefit the effective date as 03/31/1999. However, examiner has still not received the English translated foreign priority document. Examiner has not applied prior arts for the rejection (dated between the claimed France priority date 03/31/1999 and the effective date, 3/31/2000 of this

application). Applicant is requested to respond/submit the English translated foreign priority document, which would help the examiner to know whether to apply, the above-mentioned prior arts dated between 03/31/1999 and 3/31/2000, when necessary.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 4, 13-16, 22-26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 4, 13-16, 22-26, mentions, “A device retrieving apparatus in accordance with”, which is incorrect. It should be “The device retrieving apparatus in accordance with”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Amendment

5. The amendment filed 1/31/05 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

a) added limitations, “a communications path abstraction unit that removes a difference in control procedure due to a type of communications path, which connects said device retrieving apparatus with a device represented by the first device symbol, so as to provide said application unit with an identical control environment, which does not depend upon the type of said communications path, said application unit gaining access to the device via said communications path abstraction unit”, of claim 4.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. The specification does not contain subject matter containing any software or hardware to implement limitations, “a communications path abstraction unit that removes a difference in control procedure due to a type of communications path, which connects said device retrieving apparatus with a device represented by the first device symbol, so as to provide said application unit with an identical control environment, which does not depend upon the type of said communications path, said application unit gaining access to the device via said communications path abstraction unit”, as cited in claim 4. The specification, page 28, lines 4 - 18, clearly states “the difference in device type”. Hence, claim 4 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 3, 4, 13-16, 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3 and 21, recite the limitations, “the mapped individual symbol”, “said plurality of devices”, “at least one of the obtained device description”. There is insufficient antecedent

basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple different devices and individuals exist in the claim it is not clear which devices and individual is referred by theses limitations.

Claims 4 and 22, recite the limitations, “the type of said communications path”, “the device”, “the corresponding second device symbol”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple different devices exist in the claim it is not clear which device is referred by theses limitations.

Claims 13 and 23, recite the limitations, “the mapping information”, “the individual descriptions”, “the device descriptions”, “the read-out device description”, “the device description”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple different devices and individuals exist in the claim it is not clear which devices and individual is referred by theses limitations.

Claims 14 and 24, recite the limitations, “the mapping information”, “the individual descriptions”, “the device descriptions”, “the read-out device description”, “the specified position out”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple different devices and individuals exist in the claim it is not clear which devices and individual is referred by theses limitations.

Claims 15 and 25, recite the limitations, “the input specific individual description”, “said plurality of devices”, “at least one of the obtained device”, “the obtained device description”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple different devices and individuals exist in the claim it is not clear which devices and individual is referred by theses limitations.

Claims 16 and 26, recite the limitations, “the individual symbols”, “the selected specific individual symbol”, “the specific individual description out of mapping”, “said plurality of devices”, “at least one of the obtained device”, “the obtained device description”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Since, multiple different devices and individuals exist in the claim it is not clear which devices and individual is referred by theses limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3, 15, 16, 21, 22, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner in view of Minasi, Person and IDEHARA.

10. As per claims 3 and 21, Hamner discloses a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device among a plurality of devices present on a network (e.g., abstract), comprising:

a display unit having a screen (e.g., col., 3, lines 6 – 24, figure 2A),
an input that is used to externally input an instruction (e.g., col., 3, lines 15 – 24); and
an application/control unit (e.g., computer using software, col., 3, lines 25 – 44),
said application/control unit causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32),

said application/control unit (e.g., computer using software, col., 3, lines 25 – 44), when an instruction is given externally via said input unit (e.g., col., 3, lines 5 – 24) to link a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired individual (e.g., col., 4, lines 10- 48), specifying an individual description of the desired individual corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description (e.g., col., 6, lines 14 – 43, figure 2A), gaining access to a database that is present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 – 66), obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., col., 5, lines 53 – 64), which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 – 66), and causing at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device (e.g., col., 6, lines 25 – 49) expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., col., 4, lines 4-48, abstract, figures 1-2).

Hamner does not specifically mention about mapping to a desired person, individual symbol corresponding to person and individual information corresponding to the selected person. Minasi, discloses the well-known concept of mapping to a desired person (e.g., assignment of user specific information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364) using person symbol (e.g., symbols for Eric, Darcee, Aministrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and the selected person information (e.g., Eric being research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner with the teachings of Minasi in order to facilitate assigning person specific information because the usage of individual person symbol and person information would help identify individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information for the individual person. The user symbol would help the user manage its own personal settings of the desired items.

Hamner and Minasi do not specifically mention about mapping one software item to another software item. Person, discloses well-known concept of mapping one software item to another software item (e.g., drag and drop method can be used to drag one software item and drop on another software item, page 105 – page 107).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner and Minasi with the teachings of Person in order to facilitate mapping one software item to another software item because dragging a software item and dropping it on another software item would help mapping of a user symbol to the device symbol. Dragging a device symbol on the user's symbol or the window containing the user's personal settings would be an easier way of mapping a device to the desired user.

Hamner and Minasi do not specifically mention about a database in a server connected to the network. IDEHARA discloses well-known concept of a database in a server / apparatus connected to the network (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Peron with the teachings of IDEHARA in order to facilitate utilizing a database in a server / apparatus over the network

because the server / apparatus would help connect to the network. The database would help utilize the server / apparatus resources and the database would help store information.

11. As per claims 15, 16, Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA teach the claimed limitations as rejected under claim 3. Hamner, Person and Minasi do not specifically mention about the claimed subject matter of claims 15 and 16.

IDEHARA teaches when an individual description of the desired person is externally input as a specific individual description via said input unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), gaining access to a database that is present in said server (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29), obtaining a device description mapped to the input specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col.,3) which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), and causing at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151),

when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to select a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person among the individual symbols displayed on the screen (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the selected specific individual symbol as a specific individual description (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col.,3), gaining access to a database that is present in said server (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29), obtaining a device

description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151), and causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person and Minasi with the teachings of IDEHARA because IDEHARA's teachings would facilitate handling of device description information for an individual description information because the external input using keyboard would help enter specific individual description of the desired person and a database would help store the mapping information including a plurality of individual descriptions and device descriptions for the plurality of devices present on the network. The mapping information would help access a device description mapped to the specific individual description. The device description and device symbol information would help display the device related information on the screen of the display unit.

12. As per claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21 above. Hamner also discloses said control unit in the case where a device represented by the first device symbol keeps data, causes data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 –

32), which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device description and the corresponding second device symbol is displayed (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32).

13. As per claims 25, 26, Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA teach the claimed limitations as rejected under claim 21. Hamner, Person and Minasi do not specifically mention about the claimed subject matter of claims 25 and 26.

IDEHARA teaches when an individual description of the desired person is externally input as a specific individual description via said input unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), gaining access to a database that is present in an apparatus (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29) connected to the network or in said device retrieving apparatus (e.g., figures 2 and 33, paragraph 43, col., 3), obtaining a device description mapped to the input specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col., 3) which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), and causing at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151), when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to select a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person among the individual symbols displayed on the screen (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the selected specific individual symbol as a specific individual

description (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col.,3), gaining access to a database that is present in an apparatus (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29) connected to the network or in said device retrieving apparatus (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151), and causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person and Minasi with the teachings of IDEHARA because IDEHARA's teachings would facilitate handling of device description information for an individual description information because the external input using keyboard would help enter specific individual description of the desired person and a database would help store the mapping information including a plurality of individual descriptions and device descriptions for the plurality of devices present on the network. The mapping information would help access a device description mapped to the specific individual description. The device description and device symbol information would help display the device related information on the screen of the display unit.

14. Claims 13, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, in view of Minasi, Person and IDEHARA in view of Hogan et al. 5,414,809 (Hereinafter Hogan).

15. As per claim 13, Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 3. IDEHARA also teaches mapping information including the device positions -related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the device descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location in the building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said application/control unit (computer using software, paragraphs 130 -154) specifying a position mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reading a device description mapped to the specified position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the database for a fax machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 - 154), and obtaining the read-out device description as the device description mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network device, i.e., fax machine, a printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 134 -154). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person and Minasi with the teachings of IDEHARA in order to facilitate handling of device position-related information because the information of location available for the device for an individual would help select the device and have it linked in the device selection.

Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA do not specifically mention about individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions. Hogan teaches individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an individual, figure 5, col., 46, line 60 - col., 55, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions because the information about an individual including the location of an individual's office would help link with an individual's other information and the referenced information would help individual information displayed on the computer monitor when necessary.

16. As per claims 23 and 24, Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA teach the claimed limitations rejected under claim 21. IDEHARA also teaches mapping information including the device positions -related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the device descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location in the building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said control unit (computer using software) specifying a position mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reading a device description mapped to the specified position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the database for a fax

machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 - 154), and obtaining the read-out device description as the device description mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network device, i.e., fax machine, a printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 134 -154). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person and Minasi with the teachings of IDEHARA in order to facilitate handling of device position-related information because the information of location available for the device for an individual would help select the device and have it linked in the device selection.

Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA do not specifically mention about individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions. Hogan teaches individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an individual, figure 5, col., 46, line 60 - col., 55, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions because the information about an individual including the location of an individual's office would help link with an individual' s other information and the referenced information would help individual information displayed on the computer monitor when necessary.

17. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, Minasi, Person and IDEHARA in view of Malkin et al., 5,940,391 (Hereinafter Malkin).

18. As per claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above. Hamner also discloses said application/control unit in the case where the device causing data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device description and the corresponding second device symbol is displayed (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32).

Hamner, Minasi, Person and IDEHARA do not specifically mention about a communications path abstraction unit. Malkin discloses communications path abstraction unit (e.g., use of proxy device, col., 4, lines 31 – 48, col., 1, lines 51 – 59) that removes a difference (e.g., transcoding / filtering of information, col., 4, lines 31 – 48, col., 1, lines 51 – 67) in control procedure due (e.g., format based session, col., 6, lines 3 – 46) to a type of communications path (e.g., based on the session path used, col., 5, lines 6 – 38), which connects the device apparatus (e.g., devices on the network, col., 6, lines 35 – 65), so as to provide the unit with an identical control environment (e.g., same internet environment used by several devices, col., 3, lines 9 – 18), which does not depend upon the type of said communications path (e.g., addition or removal of PICS label independent of communication path, col., 4, lines 9 – 48, col., 1, lines 46 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA with the teachings of Malkin in order to facilitate usage of communications path abstraction unit because

the abstraction unit would help remove a difference due to a type of communications path. The abstraction unit would also help provide a similar environment to the device to control information independent of the type of the communication path.

19. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, Minasi, Person, IDEHARA and Malkin in view of Hogan.

20. As per claim 14, Hamner, Minasi, Person, IDEHARA and Malkin teach the claimed limitations rejected under claims 3 and 4. IDEHARA also teaches mapping information including the device positions -related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the device descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location in the building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said application unit (computer CPU using software, paragraphs 130 -154) specifying a position mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reading a device description mapped to the specified position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the database for a fax machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 - 154), and obtaining the read-out device description as the device description mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network device, i.e., fax machine, a printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 134 -154). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Minasi, Person and Malkin with the teachings of IDEHARA in order to facilitate handling of device position-related information

because the information of location available for the device for an individual would help select the device and have it linked in the device selection.

Hamner, Minasi, Person, IDEHARA and Malkin do not specifically mention about individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions. Hogan teaches individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an individual, figure 5, col., 46, line 60 - col., 55, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Minasi, Person, IDEHARA and Malkin with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions because the information about an individual including the location of an individual's office would help link with an individual's other information and the referenced information would help individual information displayed on the computer monitor when necessary.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hareesh Patel

April 8, 2005


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100